arXiv:1409.6160v1 [hep-ph] 22 Sep 2014

Test of $SU(3)$ Symmetry in Hyperon Semileptonic Decays[☆]

T. N. Pham[a]

[a]*Centre de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France*

Abstract

Existing analyzes of baryon semileptonic decays indicate the presence of a small $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays, but to provide evidence for $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking, one would need a relation similar to the Gell-Mann–Okubo (GMO) baryon mass formula which is satisfied to a few percents, showing evidence for a small $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effect in the GMO mass formula. In this talk, I would like to present a similar GMO relation obtained in a recent work for hyperon semileptonic decay axial vector current matrix elements. Using these generalized GMO relations for the measured axial vector current to vector current form factor ratios, it is shown that $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays is of $5-11\%$ and confirms the validity of the Cabibbo model for hyperon semi-leptonic decays.

Keywords: Hyperon semileptonic decays, $SU(3)$ symmetry, CKM quark mixing matrix

1. Introduction

The success of the Gell-Mann–Okubo (GMO) mass formula shows that $SU(3)$ is a good symmetry for strong interactions. This approximate symmetry can be incorporated into a QCD Lagrangian with $m_u, m_d \ll m_s$,with $m_s \ll \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. At low energies, an effective chiral Lagrangian can be constructed with baryons coupled to the pseudo-scalar meson octet, the Goldstone-Nambu boson of the $SU(3)\times SU(3)$ chiral symmetry.This Lagrangian contains the axial vector current matrix elements and produces the axial vector form factors measured in baryon semileptonic decays. The Goldberger-Treiman relation for the pion-nucleon coupling constant is also obtained directly from this chiral Lagrangian. At zero order in the current s-quark m_s, the axial vector current form factors and the pseudo-scalar meson-baryon couplings are $SU(3)$-symmetric and are completely given by the two parameters F and D of the F(antisymmetric) and D(symmetric) type coupling [1] (in the standard chiral perturbation theory notation),

$$\mathcal{L} = {\rm Tr}\Big(\bar{B}(i\not{D} - m_0)B - D(\bar{B}\gamma_\mu\{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_\mu, B\}) - F(\bar{B}\gamma_\mu[\bar{\mathcal{A}}_\mu, B])\Big) + \mathcal{L}_{\rm SB} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu + i\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\mu, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\mu = -\frac{i}{2}\Big(\xi^\dagger\partial_\mu\xi + \xi\partial_\mu\xi^\dagger\Big),$$
$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_\mu = -\frac{i}{2}\Big(\xi^\dagger\partial_\mu\xi - \xi\partial_\mu\xi^\dagger\Big),$$

Assuming $SU(3)$ symmetry, the axial vector currents matrix elements for semileptonic hyperon decays can then be described by the two $SU(3)$-symmetric F and D parameters as in the Cabibbo model [2] for which the agreement with experiments is quite good. The Cabibbo model for hadronic current for weak interaction semileptonic decays of hyperons is given as:

$$J_\mu = aJ^0_\mu + bJ^1_\mu \quad (3)$$

where J^0_μ and J^1_μ are respectively, the two $SU(3)$ octet $\Delta S = 0$ and $\Delta S = 1$ left-handed hadronic currents.

To have generalized universality for weak interaction, Cabibbo assumes that the current J_μ has "unit length" and puts $a^2 + b^2 = 1$, with $a = \cos\theta, b = \sin\theta$ [2]. This is exactly the unitarity relation for the two-generation CKM quark mixing matrix,

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 = 1 \quad (4)$$

The remarkable fact is that, using $SU(3)$ symmetry for the matrix elements of K and π meson and hyperon semileptonic decays, the predictions of the Cabibbo

[☆]Talk given at QCD14, the 17th International QCD Conference, 30 June–4 July 2014, Montpellier (France).

model are in good agreement with experiments [3]. The suppressed rates for K meson and hyperon semileptonic decays are explained. Since the Fermi coupling constant for nuclear β decay is given by $G_\beta = G\cos\theta$, the discrepancy between ^{14}O and muon lifetime is resolved.

Looking back, the Cabibbo model is a first step toward the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) model for weak interactions, following the discovery of charm and bottom hadrons with the GIM mechanism and CP-violation incorporated, with the CKM quark mixing matrix:

$$V_{\rm CKM} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

which can be parametrized by three mixing angles and the CP-violating KM phase [4].

Thus the success of the Cabibbo model comes out naturally with the GIM mechanism and the unitarity of the CKM matrix. This model also confirms the validity of $SU(3)$ symmetry in hyperon semileptonic decays, but one expects some symmetry breaking effects.

To have a precise determination of V_{us} from hyperon semileptonic decays, one would need a good estimate of $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects. In the past there have been many works on $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays, for example, in Refs. [5–13] etc. and more recently in Ref. [14]. These works indicate the presence of a small $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays. But to provide evidence for $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking, one needs a relation similar to the Gell-Mann–Okubo (GMO) baryon mass formula. In this talk I would like to present GMO relations for hyperon semileptonic decays obtained in a recent work [15] and show that the amount of $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays is $5-11\%$.

2. The GMO relations for hyperon semileptonic decays

In the standard model, $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking is given by the current quark mass term in the QCD Lagrangian with $m_{u,d} \ll m_s$. As an example, to derive the GMO relation for baryon mass difference, consider now the divergence of the $\Delta S = 1$ V-spin $V = 1$ vector current $\bar{u}\gamma_\mu s$. It is given by:

$$\partial_\mu(\bar{u}\gamma_\mu s) = -i\, m_s \bar{u} s \tag{6}$$

The baryon mass difference is given by the $\bar{u}s$ scalar current form factor at the momentum transfer $q = 0$, in the limit of $SU(3)$ symmetry:

$$< \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^0 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Lambda|\bar{u}s|\Xi^- > = - < p|\bar{u}s|\frac{1}{2}\Sigma^0 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Lambda > \tag{7}$$

$$< \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Sigma^0 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda|\bar{u}s|\Xi^- > = < p|\bar{u}s|\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Sigma^0 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda > \tag{8}$$

with $|\Xi^- >= |V = 1, V_3 = 1>$, $|p >= |V = 1, V_3 = -1>$ and $|\frac{1}{2}\Sigma^0 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Lambda >= |V = 1, V_3 = 0>$, $|\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Sigma^0 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda >= |V = 0, V_3 = 0>$.

Eqs. (7–8) are the rotated V-spin version of the two I-spin relations for the $\bar{u}d$ matrix elements: $< B'|\partial_\mu(\bar{u}\gamma_\mu s)|B >$ given by $(f_1)_{B\to B'}(m_{B'} - m_B)$, $(f_1)_{B\to B'}$ being the form factor at $q^2 = 0$ momentum transfer in the vector current $< B'|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu s|B >$ matrix element which has no first order $SU(3)$ breaking effect according to the Ademollo-Gatto theorem [16]. We thus have,

$$[(1/4)(m_{\Xi^-} - m_{\Sigma^0}) + (3/4)(m_{\Xi^-} - m_\Lambda)] = [(1/4)(m_{\Sigma^0} - m_p) + (3/4)(m_\Lambda - m_p)] \tag{9}$$

$$[(m_{\Xi^-} - m_{\Sigma^0}) - (m_{\Xi^-} - m_\Lambda)) = -[(m_{\Sigma^0} - m_p) - (m_\Lambda - m_p)] \tag{10}$$

Eq. (9) reproduces the GMO relation:

$$(3/4)(m_\Lambda - m_N) + (1/4)(m_\Sigma - m_N) = (3/4)(m_\Xi - m_\Lambda) + (1/4)(m_\Xi - m_\Sigma) \tag{11}$$

while Eq. (10) reduces to a trivial identity.

The l.h.s and r.h.s of Eq. (9) is 0.1867 GeV and 0.1966 GeV respectively, showing a small $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects, of the order $d = 0.05$, the ratio of the difference between the l.h.s and r.h.s to the average of the two quantities and one would expect similar amount of symmetry breaking in hyperon semileptonic decays.

By making a substitution $\bar{u}s \to \bar{u}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 s$ in the $V-$spin relations for the matrix elements of $\bar{u}s$ in Eqs. (7,8), the two GMO relations for the axial vector current matrix elements are obtained

$$< \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^0 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Lambda|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 s|\Xi^- > = - < p|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 s|\frac{1}{2}\Sigma^0 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Lambda > \tag{12}$$

$$< \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Sigma^0 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 s|\Xi^- > = < p|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 s|\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Sigma^0 - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda > \tag{13}$$

In terms of $(g_1/f_1)_{B\to B'}$ the axial vector current to vector current form factor ratios [18], the two GMO relations

Decay	f_1	$(g_1/f_1)_{SU(3)+SB}$	$(g_1/f_1)_{\rm exp}$[19, 20]	$d_{B\to B'}$(est.)
$n\to p\ell\bar{\nu}$	1	$F+D$	1.2694 ± 0.0028	
$\Lambda\to p\ell\bar{\nu}$	$-\sqrt{3/2}$	$F+D/3+d_{\Lambda\to p}$	0.718 ± 0.015	$-0.015-0.011$
$\Sigma^-\to n\ell\bar{\nu}$	-1	$F-D+d_{\Sigma^-\to n}$	-0.340 ± 0.017	-0.034(input)
$\Xi^-\to\Lambda^0\ell\bar{\nu}$	$\sqrt{3/2}$	$F-D/3+d_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda}$	0.25 ± 0.05	$0.053-0.023$
$\Xi^0\to\Sigma^+\ell\bar{\nu}$	1	$F+D+d_{\Xi^0\to\Sigma^+}$	1.21 ± 0.05	-0.06(data)
$\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0\ell\bar{\nu}$	$1/\sqrt{2}$	$F+D+d_{\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0}$		
$\Sigma^-\to\Lambda\ell\bar{\nu}$	0	$(g_1)_{SU(3)}=\sqrt{2/3}D$	$(g_1)_{\rm exp}=$	$-0.070-0.028$
$\Sigma^+\to\Lambda\ell\bar{\nu}$	0	$(g_1)_{SU(3)}=\sqrt{2/3}D$	0.587 ± 0.016	$-0.070-0.028$

Table 1: Vector and axial vector current form factors for baryon semileptonic decays in the Cabibbo model and with $SU(3)$ breaking term $d_{B\to B'}$ and the measured axial vector to vector form factor ratio g_1/f_1, the $SU(3)$ and measured values for $(g_1)_{\Sigma^-\to\Lambda}$. The last column is the estimated $d_{B\to B'}$.

become,

$$(1/4)(g_1/f_1)_{\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0}+(3/4)(g_1/f_1)_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda} = (1/4)(g_1/f_1)_{\Sigma^0\to p}+(3/4)(g_1/f_1)_{\Lambda\to p} \quad (14)$$

$$(3/4)[(g_1/f_1)_{\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0}-(g_1/f_1)_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda}] = -(3/4)[(g_1/f_1)_{\Sigma^0\to p}-(g_1/f_1)_{\Lambda\to p}] \quad (15)$$

In the exact $SU(3)$ symmetry limit, the l.h.s and r.h.s of Eq. (14) as well as that of Eq. (15) are equal, given by F and D, respectively. Violation of the above relations comes from first and second order $SU(3)$ breaking terms, but second order terms could be less important because of possible cancellation in $(g_1/f_1)_{B\to B'}$. Thus the validity of the above relations would depend essentially on first order $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects.

In the presence of $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking, the l.h.s and r.h.s of Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) thus differ and are given by,

$$L_1 = F+(1/4)\,d_{\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0}+(3/4)\,d_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda},$$
$$R_1 = F+(1/4)\,d_{\Sigma^0\to p}+(3/4)\,d_{\Lambda\to p} \quad (16)$$

and

$$L_2 = D+(3/4)\,(d_{\Xi^-\to\Sigma^0}-d_{\Xi^-\to\Lambda}),$$
$$R_2 = D-(3/4)\,(d_{\Sigma^0\to p}-d_{\Lambda\to p}) \quad (17)$$

with $d_{B\to B'}$ the corresponding symmetry breaking term.

The differences $\Delta_1=L_1-R_1$ and $\Delta_2=L_2-R_2$ depend only on the symmetry breaking terms and are measures of $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking.

From the measured values in Table 1, we have

$$L_1=0.490\pm0.05,\quad R_1=0.453\pm0.015,\quad \Delta_1=0.036\pm0.065 \quad (18)$$

$$L_2=0.720\pm0.075,\quad R_2=0.793\pm0.024,\quad \Delta_2=-0.073\pm0.10 \quad (19)$$

showing on average, an amount of $SU(3)$ breaking of 4% from Δ_1 and 10% from Δ_2 (ignoring experimental errors), to be compared with an amount of $SU(3)$ breaking of 5% in $<B'|\bar{u}s|B>$.

The $SU(3)$-symmetric fit in Ref. [7] produces an $SU(3)$ value $(g_1/f_1)_{\Sigma^-\to n}=-0.3178$ to be compared with the measured value of -0.340 ± 0.017. This implies an $SU(3)$ breaking of 6.5%. Taking $d_{\Sigma^-\to n}=-0.034$, we obtain

$$F=0.464+017,\quad D=0.805-0.017 \quad (20)$$

Thus $d_{\Sigma^-\to n}$ makes a rather small contribution to F and D. This provides us with a quite precise determination of F and D, using the two GMO relations we found. With F and D determined, the symmetry breaking term $d_{B\to B'}$ are then obtained from the measured $(g_1/f_1)_{B\to B'}$ as shown in Table 1. One would expect second order $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects to be quite small for both vector and axial vector current matrix elements. The determination of V_{us} could be made by using the measured g_1/f_1 and neglecting second order $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects in the vector current form factor f_1. The values for V_{us} thus obtained in Refs. [7, 17] are consistent with each other, and also agrees with the KTeV value from neutral kaon semileptonic decays, as quoted in Ref. [17] : $V_{us}=0.2250\pm0.0027$[17], $V_{us}=0.22376\pm0.00259$ [7] , to be compared with $V_{us}=0.2252\pm0.0005_{\rm KTeV}\pm0.0009_{\rm ext}$ from KTeV. For a more precise determination of V_{us} from hyperon decays one would need to compute second order $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking effects for f_1, as done in lattice calculation of the K_{l3} $f_+(0)$ form factor which gives $V_{us}=0.2246\pm0.0012$ [19]. Since V_{us} obtained from hyperon semileptonic decays [7, 17] is close to the value extracted from the measured average of $V_{us}f_+(0)=0.2163$ of various K_{l3} measurements [21],

with corrections from second order $SU(3)$ breaking for $f_+(0)$ given by chiral perturbation theory and lattice QCD calculations, second order $SU(3)$ breaking in the vector current form factor f_1 would be very small, as mentioned above.

3. Conclusion

The GMO relation for baryon mass difference is quite general and can be derived for the axial vector current matrix elements in hyperon semileptonic decays. This relation provides evidence for an $SU(3)$ breaking effect of the order $5-11\%$ in hyperon semileptonic decays. The small symmetry breaking effect we find also confirms the success of the Cabibbo model for hyperon semileptonic decays. Finally, these GMO relations could be used as experimental constraints on the $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking terms in theoretical calculations.

4. Acknowledgments

I would like to thank S. Narison and the organizers of QCD 2014 for the warm hospitality extended to me at Montpellier.

References

[1] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, and B. R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the Standard Model*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).
[2] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett **10** (1963) 531.
[3] R. E. Marshak, Riazuddin and C. P. Ryan, *Theory of Weak Interactions in Particle Physics*, John Wiley, New York (1969).
[4] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** (1973) 652.
[5] J. F. Donoghue, B. R. Holstein, and S. W. Klimt, Phys. Rev. D **35** (1987) 934.
[6] M. Roos, Phys. Lett. B **246** (1990) 179.
[7] P. M. Gensini and G. Violini, Talk presented at *the 5th International Symposium on Meson-Nucleon Physics and the Structure of the Nucleon*, Boulder, Colorado, 6-10 Sept. 1993, Edited by B.M.K. Nefkens, M. Clajus. Pi N Newslett. (1993) Nos. 8, 9; arXiv:hep-ph/9311270 (1993).
[8] P. G. Ratcliffe, Phys. Lett. B **365** (1996) 383.
[9] X. Song, P. K. Kabir, and J. S. McCarthy, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 2108.
[10] J. Dai, R. Dashen, E. Jenkins, and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 273.
[11] R. Flores-Mendieta, E. Jenkins, and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 094028.
[12] T. Yamanishi, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 014006.
[13] A. Faessler, T. Gutsche, B. R. Holstein, M. A. Ivanov, J. G. Körner, and V. E. Liubovitskij, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 094005.
[14] A. Upadhyay and M. Batra, Eur.Phys. J. A49 (2013) 160.
[15] T. N. Pham, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 016002.
[16] M. Ademollo and R. Gatto, Phys. Rev. Lett **13**, (1963) 264 .
[17] N. Cabibbo, E. C. Swallow, and R. Winston, Phys. Rev. Lett **92** (2004) 251803.
[18] M. Bourquin *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **21** (1983)27.
[19] Particle Data Group, J. Beringer *et al*, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 010001.
[20] M. Bourquin *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **12** (1982) 307.
[21] B. Sciascia, Talk at CKM2010, the 6th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle, University of Warwick, UK 6-10 September 2010, arXiv:1101.5024 [hep-ph] (2011).